

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5 are amended. Claims 7-12 are added. The amendments do not add new matter and entry at this time is proper.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. The amendments, in conjunction with the following remarks, are believed to place the application in immediate condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments and favorable consideration of the application respectfully are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Though claims 1-5 are amended, Applicants do not concede that the Office Action's statutory rejections are proper. The amendments are understood not to narrow the scope of the claimed invention, nor are they made for reasons related to patentability. Rather, the amendments are made to clarify the claimed invention. Thus, in future construction or interpretation, the amended claims are entitled to a full range of equivalents.

Applicants note that acknowledgement is made for the claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119. Applicants, however, note that the Information Disclosure Statement filed November 8, 2001, has not been considered by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the Information Disclosure

Statement and provide copies of the initialed PTO-1449 after such consideration.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants note with appreciation the indication on page 3 of the Office Action that claims 2 and 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,164,717 (Wells et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

To anticipate, the cited patent must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants maintain that Wells does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Wells does not disclose a stipple buffer for holding gradation data of an anti-alias font transferred from a CPU to the stipple buffer, as recited in amended claims 1 and 3.

For example, referring to Applicants' claim 1, an anti-alias font generator is disclosed. The anti-alias font generator includes a stipple buffer for holding gradation data of an anti-alias font transferred from a CPU to the stipple buffer. The anti-alias font generator also includes a source color register for

setting a font display color. The anti-alias font generator also includes a blender for blending a value of the source color register and a destination color value on a frame memory in accordance with a blend coefficient which is the gradation data held in the stipple buffer.

By moving the gradation data to the stipple buffer on the anti-alias font generator, Applicants maintain that the processing load on the CPU is reduced and the processing speed of the anti-alias font is increased. For example, as recited in claim 1, the blender blends the value of the source color register and a destination color value in accordance with a blend coefficient, which is the gradation data held in the stipple buffer in the anti-alias font generator, and not in the CPU.

In contrast, Wells describes performing its compositing and dithering processing at the CPU. Wells relates to a method and apparatus for dithering of anti-alias vectors. Wells describes compositing that is performed prior to dithering. Column 7, lines 35-39. Pixel data representing the anti-alias vector is, at block 110, composited with the corresponding pixel data contained in the frame buffer. The compositing process blends a foreground color and intensity into the background color and intensity to provide a smoothing affect, or transition, between the foreground and the background.

Wells also describes an alpha component that contains a value determinative of the proportion of the incoming color that is to be blended into the color pixel retrieved from the frame buffer. Once the vector is composited with the corresponding pixels of the digital image, the pixel data output from the compositing is dithered to a second, lower resolution for storage in the frame buffer and for subsequent output through graphics display device.

Figure 3 of Wells shows a CPU 3 and a memory 4. Wells does not disclose a stipple buffer on an anti-alias font generator, or that CPU 3 transfers the alpha component to a stipple buffer. According to Wells, CPU 3 composites, or blends, and dithers the anti-alias vector and the pixel data in the frame buffer. Wells does not disclose using a stipple buffer, or transferring data to the stipple buffer in performing these actions.

In contrast, the claimed invention transfers the gradation data to a stipple buffer, and then blends the value of the source color register and a destination color value on a frame memory in accordance with a blend coefficient that is the gradation data. Applicants maintain the alpha component is not transferred from a CPU to a stipple buffer on an anti-alias font generator, as recited in the claimed invention. Further, the alpha component of Wells is not held in the stipple buffer for blending the anti-alias vector and pixel data in the frame buffer of Wells. All the actions

described in Wells are executed on CPU 3. For at least these reasons, Wells fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1 and 3.

Moreover, Wells does not disclose the stipple color selector for selecting the value of the plurality of display color registers in accordance with the gradation data held in the stipple buffer, as recited in claim 5. Referring to claim 5, Wells does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention recited in claim 5. Wells does not disclose a stipple color selector for selecting a value of the plurality of display color registers in accordance with the gradation data. Wells also does not disclose using a plurality of display color registers in compositing the pixel data.

Further, Wells does not disclose setting a display color on the bases of a gradation value used in a plurality of display color registers. Referring to the alpha component of Wells, Wells does not disclose using the alpha component to select a value of the plurality of display color registers. Therefore, Wells does not disclose each and every element of claim 5.

Thus, claims 1, 3, and 5 distinguish over Wells at least for the reasons given above. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejections.

New Claims

Claims 7-12 are added to clarify embodiments of the present invention. Claims 7-15 recite subject matter similar, and in addition, to independent claims 1, 3 and 5. Therefore, claims 7-12 are allowable at least for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact William F. Nixon (Reg. No. 44,262) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

MRC/WFN/kpc